



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

No such league based on force could possibly succeed if it were made exclusive, and the rest of the powers were forced to feel that they were to be under the compulsion of the mailed fist of the four as to their conduct in reference to one another. History has made perfectly clear what the result of such a coalition would be.

But Mr. Carnegie is probably entirely right in believing that Emperor William holds the key, or at least one of the keys, to the conditions which would lead to the abolition of war among the civilized nations. Germany and Great Britain, more than any other or all others of the powers, stood in the way at The Hague last year of the adoption of certain measures which would have made war extremely improbable, if not impossible, in the future. Germany refused to have anything to do with limitation of armaments and declined to accept the proposition for a general treaty of obligatory arbitration, even of limited scope, to both of which Great Britain was favorable. Great Britain, in her turn, rejected the proposal for an agreement to make unoffending private property at sea exempt from capture in time of war, a proposal favored by the Kaiser's government. These reserves of the two great powers on opposite sides of the North Sea put a big stick in the wheels of the Hague Conference which blocked the whole machinery. Now, if the German government, led by the Kaiser, would say to Great Britain, "we will accept a general treaty of obligatory arbitration and the principle of limitation of armaments, and will be ready sincerely to coöperate with you and other powers in carrying these principles into operation, provided the British government will agree to the immunity of private property at sea," the greatest political obstacle to the further progress of the cause of world peace would be out of the way. Something like this would have to take place in any event between Germany and England, even if the Kaiser should attempt to create a league of compulsory peace, as suggested by Mr. Carnegie. If this, however, were done, there would be absolutely no demand for such a league of force, for a world league of a purely pacific nature composed of all the nations would be the natural and almost immediate result. It is along this line that the Kaiser's supreme opportunity lies.

### Are Armaments Only Mere Symptoms?

Hon. Richard Bartholdt, president of the United States Group of the Interparliamentary Union, in an instructive and interesting article on the history and work of the Union, in the *Christian Endeavor World* for September 17, uses the following language:

"And right here it might be stated that the union of lawmakers of which I write is neither opposed to adequate armament, nor does it advocate disarmament as

an independent proposition. Its members have learned that no headway whatever can be made along these lines. Surely, like all well-meaning men and women, they would like to see the world disarm in order that the billions now spent for preparations for war might be expended for the advancement of education, science and art, and for the improvement of rivers and roads (and if this could be done, what a paradise the world would be!), but they now realize the futility of all efforts in that direction, as this has been so amply demonstrated by the two peace conferences at The Hague.

"Armaments are merely symptoms of a cause, and the cause is the absence of international agreements to keep the peace. It will be easier to remove the cause first by securing such agreements, and, when these have been once secured, the symptom is bound to disappear along with the cause."

Mr. Bartholdt is usually so clear and correct in his statements and his reasoning that one hesitates to point out what seem to be errors in what he says. But this statement of his is open to two or three strictures. His language seems to charge that other "well-meaning men and women," outside of the Interparliamentary Union, are advocating disarmament as an independent proposition. This is not the fact, so far as we know. The most extreme advocates of the abolition of armaments have always insisted, as the fundamental feature of their program, that the nations should enter into solemn and permanent "agreements to keep the peace," and thus remove the excuse for armaments, as well as armaments themselves. That has been the historic method of the pacifists, and it is their method at the present time. Their urgent plea, not for disarmament at first, but for limitation, for arrest of the everlasting rivalry in the development of armaments, is backed not only by the conviction of the wickedness and folly of the burdensome system of competitive arming, but also by the fact that enough has already been done through the Hague Conferences and otherwise in establishing a recognized and adequate substitute for war to justify, or rather to demand, an immediate suspension of the current military and naval rivalry. This, if we remember rightly his speech in Congress last spring against the building of four new battleships, is Mr. Bartholdt's own position. It is likewise the position of the Interparliamentary Union, as expressed by its action at London two years ago.

Again, Mr. Bartholdt hardly states the case accurately when he says that the futility of efforts for disarmament has been amply demonstrated by the two peace conferences at The Hague. The truth is that the subject of disarmament was not before the Conference at all. It was the much more modest proposition of an arrest of the growth of armaments with which that body was last year asked by Great Britain to deal; and the efforts made in this direction, while without immediate practical

results, though having the tacit approval of at least three-fourths of the powers, can hardly be said to have been futile, unless one apply the same adjective to the efforts to secure the passage of several other important measures,—for example, a general treaty of obligatory arbitration,—which the Conference failed to approve, though they were advanced a good way toward final adoption. The second Hague Conference brought the question of armaments into practical international politics and left it about the liveliest question of the day. That was certainly not futile, as time will show.

We cannot wholly agree with Mr. Bartholdt that "armaments are merely symptoms of a cause." They are symptoms, but they are a good deal more. They have become a part of the malady itself, working mischief on a vast scale, like the new germs which develop within a body which has been infected by the virus of a disease. They have sprung from the hatreds engendered by the wars of the past, from national ambition and greed, from racial prejudices and animosities, from fear, suspicion and distrust. What has produced them and their enormous increase in recent years is only in a very small degree "the absence of international agreements to keep the peace," but the much deeper causes just pointed out above. These causes, many of them at any rate, have been much intensified and aggravated by the armaments themselves as enlarged in recent years. These great military and naval establishments have powerfully contributed to keeping alive and active international distrust and fear. They have been the prolific source of senseless misinterpretation of national feelings and motives, and of wild talk of invasions and war. To neglect them as mere symptoms is to put off the day of their limitation and final suppression much longer than it ought to be put off.

The point of this reflection is, that the whole system of militarism, root and branch, must be dealt with at the same time, both directly and indirectly. "International agreements to keep the peace," to use Mr. Bartholdt's phraseology, already well advanced in imperfect and tentative forms, must be carried forward to completeness with all possible dispatch. That is fundamental. Enmities and suspicions, prejudices and misunderstandings, between nations and races, out of which the big armaments grow, must be removed. That is even more fundamental. But, at the same time, in order to expedite these difficult processes, the rivalry of armaments, which deepens and strengthens all the existing misunderstandings and unworthy feelings between the nations, must be set forth in all its folly and wickedness, and a stop put to it at the earliest possible date. This is the full program, no part of which can be neglected without endangering the success of the other parts.

## The Interparliamentary Conference at Berlin.

Two most important international meetings were held the past month, connected with the movement for world peace, the Conference of the Interparliamentary Union at Berlin and that of the International Law Association at Budapest. Of the latter we are not at this writing in possession of sufficient data to give any sort of account.

The Interparliamentary Conference, which opened at Berlin on the 17th of September, with delegates from nineteen countries, was a remarkably significant gathering. The meetings were held in the Chamber of the Reichstag. At the opening session the seats of the Chamber would not accommodate all the delegates, of whom there were some eight hundred, many of whom were ranged against the walls or stood in the doorways during the opening ceremonies. On the platform sat Prince von Buelow, the German Chancellor, and by his side the venerable Frederic Passy of France, now eighty-six years old, who assisted in founding the Union in 1888-89. In the ministerial seats behind the Chancellor sat nearly all of the members of both the Imperial and the Prussian Cabinets. Among the distinguished guests on the platform were David Jayue Hill, the American Ambassador, and Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, president of Columbia University.

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Eckhoff, chairman of the German delegation, and Prince Heinrich von Schoenaich-Carolath was chosen president of the Conference.

In his address of welcome on behalf of the government, Prince von Buelow said that the delegates would find in Germany sympathetic appreciation of their achievements and their aims, and that the government was with them in the end for which they were working. As a proof of the vital interest which Germany is taking in the questions with which the Interparliamentary Union concerns itself, the Chancellor called attention to the fact that it was his government that at the Hague Conference last year proposed the establishment of the International Prize Court, and that the German delegation supported the plan for a permanent Court of Arbitral Justice, and signed the protocol recommending its establishment. The German government had also in various treaties made use of the arbitration principle, and had embodied it in their trade treaties. Though Germany, he said, taught in the school of hard experience for three centuries, was and must be strong enough to defend her territory, her dignity and her independence, she had not misused her strength, nor would she do so. "The German people longed for peace founded on right and justice, and having kept that peace for many years, they had proved